



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31498
Title of the Manuscript:	Population structure and Regeneration of Croton scabiosus Bedd. (Euphorbiaceae) in dry forests of Southern Eastern Ghats of YSR Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh, India
Type of Article:	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
It must be categorically stated that the paper is much improved from the previous submitted version. However, the paper still have deficiencies in certain areas, which include: 1. Language is still not on par of what is expected – some effort has been made to assist in this regard. 2. Methodology: The issue of density is vague: Is it density (individuals per area?) or distance to nearest neighbor?). This needs clarification. - How many height classes were there, and how were they defined? 3. Results: - Interspersed with duplications and discussions. - Unstructured - Throwing together results (as this paper does) from scrub and dry forests gives an overall impression of the study area, but say nothing about the various ecosystems (dry vs scrub) and the intra/inter variations encountered. This lessens the impact of this paper and its value. This also impacts negatively on the proposed recommendations; because it does not address individual ecosystems (dry and scrub). Thus it is unclear why the paper mentions scrub/dry and then throws everything together. Suggest 8 paragraphs: Paragraph 1 -4: focusing on POPULATION STRUCTURE 1st present overall results of all forests 2nd present results from dry forests 3rd present data from scrub forest 4th highlight differences in various (scrub vs dry) forests Paragraph 5-8: focusing on REGENERATION follows the same format as suggested above. c. It must be made clear in the figures legends below that these are overall results. 4. Discussion This section is extremely weak. - It is without references that could substantiate statements made about perceived phenomena. Thus it is wild statements, with nothing to back it up. - It contains information (1st sentences) which is not linked to any relevant data. Thus it has no value. - The various Graphs/Figs and Tables are not discussed. - If the above suggestion on new results structure is accepted then the discussion should follow the same sequence.	Language: we did our best to improve Methodology rewritten Details given This section has been rewritten taking into account of the comments of the reviewer Followed the format suggested We did our best to improve this section. It is almost rewritten